The Theological Significance of ἑταῖρε (*Hetaire*) in the Gospel of Matthew: Divine Rejection, False Kinship, and the True Family of God

La significâtion théologitchique d'ἑταῖρε (*Hetaire*) dans l'Êvangile d'Matthieu: La r'jection divine, la fausse parenté, et la vraie fanmil'ye dé Dgieu

ἑταῖρε（Hetaire）在馬太福音中的神學意義：神聖的拒絕、虛假的友誼，與上帝真正的家人

- Frank Leo 劉宗唐 משה הלוי *Φραγκίσκος Μωυσῆς Λευίτάκης*
משה לוין (לעווין)

PART I: INTRODUCTION — THE LINGUISTIC KEY TO DIVINE REJECTION

PREUNMIÉ PARTIE: ÎNTROUDUCTION — LA CLÉ LINGUISTIQUE D'LA R'JECTION DIVINE

第一部分：導論——通往神聖拒絕之語言學鑰匙

[English]

In the Gospel according to Matthew, Jesus Christ employs a particular form of address on three occasions that has profound theological implications far beyond what most English translations convey. The vocative ἑταῖρε (*hetaire*), rendered in English simply as "friend," appears exclusively in Matthew 20:13, Matthew 22:12, and Matthew 26:50. This word is not the warm, intimate φίλος (*philos*) — the term of genuine affection and deep relational bond — but rather a word that carries the connotation of a "supposed friend," a companion in outward appearance who is, in reality, an impostor or one whose heart is fundamentally misaligned with the one addressing him. As the HELPS Word-studies entry for Strong's Greek 2083 states: "ἑταῖρος (*hetairos*) — properly, a companion (normally an impostor), posing to be a comrade but in reality only has his own interests in mind." The word suggests "someone viewed (associated) as a friend, but is actually an impostor acting for self-gain."

This is not merely a matter of lexical curiosity. It is a matter of eternal consequence. In every instance where Jesus uses ἑταῖρε, the addressee occupies a position of outward privilege — a hired labourer in the vineyard of God, an invited guest at the wedding banquet of the King's Son, or a trusted member of the Twelve — and yet harbours an inner disloyalty, a self-serving presumption, or an outright betrayal. The word ἑταῖρε thus becomes, on the lips of Jesus, a surgical instrument of divine diagnosis: it exposes the chasm between outward association with the Kingdom and inward belonging to the family of God.

By contrast, in John 15:15, Jesus uses the word φίλος (*philos*) when He declares to His faithful disciples: "No longer do I call you servants... but I have called you friends (φίλους, *philous*)." The φίλος is the one who has entered into genuine covenantal intimacy with Christ. The ἑταῖρος, however, remains outside that intimacy — associated, perhaps, but never adopted; proximate, but never truly kin.

This essay will examine each of the three occurrences of ἑταῖρε in Matthew's Gospel with exegetical precision, demonstrating that in each case the word functions as a marker of divine rejection — a rejection not of strangers, but of those who should have been family yet failed to cross the threshold from mere association into genuine spiritual kinship. The essay will then turn to Matthew 12:48–50, where Jesus Himself defines the criterion for becoming His brother, sister, and mother — that is, a true child of God — establishing the standard against which each ἑταῖρε falls short.

[Jèrriais]

Dans l'Êvangile sèlon Matthieu, Jésus-Chrît emplyie eune forme particuliéthe d'adresse à trais r'prînses tchi a des implications théologitchiques profondes bein au-d'là d'tchi qué la pus grande partie des traductions anglaises convéyent. L'vocatif ἑταῖρε (*hetaire*), rendu en anglais sîmpliément couôme "friend" (anmîn), apparaît exclusiv'ment dans Matthieu 20:13, Matthieu 22:12, et Matthieu 26:50. Ch't mot-là n'est pon l'chaud et întîme φίλος (*philos*) — l'tèrme d'affection véthitable et d'lian profond — mais pus tôt un mot tchi porte la connotâtion d'un "faux anmîn," un compagnon en apparence externe tchi est, en réalité, un împosteux ou un tchi a l'tchoeu fondamentalement inaîsé auve chuîn tchi l'adresse. Couôme l'analyse HELPS Word-studies pouor Strong's Grec 2083 l'înditchue: "ἑταῖρος (*hetairos*) — proprement, un compagnon (normalement un împosteux), fîngnant d'être un camarade mais en réalité n'ayant qué ses propres întérêts en tête." L'mot suîggèthe "tchitch'un veu (associé) couôme un anmîn, mais tchi est en vrai un împosteux agissant pouor son propre bénéfice."

Chennechîn n'est pon sîmpliément eune affaithe dé curiosité lexicale. Ch'est eune affaithe dé conséquence étèrnelle. Dans châque cas ouoù Jésus emplyie ἑταῖρε, l'adressé otchupe eune position dé previlège externe — un ouvrier embauché dans la vîngne dé Dgieu, un învité au banquet d'nopces du Fis du Roi, ou un membre d'confiance des Douze — et pouortant i' r'chèle eune déloyauté întèrne, eune

présomption égoïste, ou eune trahison ouvèrte. L'mot ἑταῖρε d'vient aînsîn, sus les lèvres dé Jésus, un înstrument chirurgical dé diagnostic divin: i' met à nu l'gouffre entre l'association externe auve l'Rouoyaume et l'appartenance întèrne à la fanmil'ye dé Dgieu.

Par contraste, dans Jean 15:15, Jésus emplyie l'mot φίλος (*philos*) quand Il décliathe à Ses fidèles dîsciples: "Jé n'ous app'le pus sèrviteurs... mais jé ous ai app'lé anmîns (φίλους, *philous*)." L'φίλος est chuîn tchi est entré dans eune véthitable întîmité d'alliance auve Chrît. L'ἑταῖρος, en contraithe, d'meuthe en d'houors d'chette întîmité — associé, p't-être, mais janmais adopté; prochain, mais janmais vrai parent.

Ch't essai-chîn examinétha châque des trais occurrences d'ἑταῖρε dans l'Êvangile dé Matthieu auve précision exégétique, démontrant qué dans châque cas l'mot fonctionne couôme un marque dé r'jection divine — eune r'jection pon des étrangiéthes, mais d'tchés-là tchi tch'éthaient d'vî être d'la fanmil'ye et pourtant ont manqué d'travèrser l'sé d'la sîmple association à la véthitable parenté spirituelle.

[中文]

在馬太福音中，耶穌基督在三個場合使用了一種特殊的稱呼方式，其神學意涵遠超大多數中英文譯本所能傳達的深度。呼格形式 ἑταῖρε（*hetaire*），在中文中通常僅被譯為「朋友」，專門出現在馬太福音20:13、馬太福音22:12，以及馬太福音26:50。這個詞並非表達溫暖親密之情的φίλος（*philos*）——那是真正的摯愛與深層關係的用語——而是帶有「假朋友」之含意的詞彙：外表看來是同伴，實際上卻是冒充者，或者其內心根本與稱呼他之人不在同一條線上。正如Strong氏希臘文2083條的HELPS詞彙研究所指出的：「ἑταῖρος（*hetairos*）——準確地說，是一個同伴（通常是冒充者），假裝是同志，但實際上只顧自身利益。」這個詞暗示「某人被看作（被聯繫為）朋友，但實際上是為了私利而行事的冒充者。」

這不僅僅是詞彙學上的趣聞。這是關乎永恆的大事。在耶穌使用ἑταῖρε的每一個場合中，被稱呼者都佔據著外在特權的位置——在上帝的葡萄園中受雇的工人、在王子婚宴上受邀的

賓客，或是十二門徒中受信任的成員——然而內心卻藏著不忠、自以為是的僭越，或者公然的背叛。因此，ἑταῖρε在耶穌口中成為一把神聖診斷的手術刀：它揭露了外在與天國的聯繫和內在歸屬上帝家庭之間的鴻溝。

相比之下，在約翰福音15:15中，耶穌對祂忠心的門徒使用的是φίλος（*philos*）這個詞：「以後我不再稱你們為僕人……我乃稱你們為朋友（φίλους, *philous*）。」φίλος是那已經進入與基督真正盟約親密關係的人。而ἑταῖρος卻始終停留在那親密關係之外——或許有所關聯，但從未被收養；或許近在咫尺，但從未真正成為家人。

本文將以精確的釋經方法檢視ἑταῖρε在馬太福音中的三次出現，論證在每一個場合中，這個詞都發揮著神聖拒絕之標記的功能——這種拒絕不是針對陌生人，而是針對那些本應成為家人、卻未能跨過從單純聯繫到真正屬靈血親之門檻的人。本文隨後將轉向馬太福音12:48-50，在那裡耶穌親自定義了成為祂弟兄、姊妹和母親——即成為上帝真正兒女——的標準，以此建立每一位ἑταῖρε所未能達到的準繩。

PART II: MATTHEW 20:13 — THE ENVIOUS WORKER AND THE REJECTION OF SELF-ENTITLED RELIGION

DEUXIÉME PARTIE: MATTHIEU 20:13 — L'OUVRIER ENVIEUX ET LA R'JECTION D'LA RELIGION TCHI S'SENT EN DROUAIT

第二部分：馬太福音**20:13——**嫉妒的工人與自以為有特權之宗教的拒絕

[English]

The Koine Greek text of Matthew 20:13 reads:

ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ἑνὶ αὐτῶν εἶπεν· Ἑταῖρε, οὐκ ἀδικῶ σε· οὐχὶ δηναρίου συνεφώνησάς μοι;

Transliteration: *Ho de apokritheis heni autōn eipen: Hetaire, ouk adikō se; ouchi dēnariou synephōnēsas moi?*

Translation: "But he, answering one of them, said: 'Friend, I do you no wrong. Did you not agree with me for a denarius?'"

This verse stands within the Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard (Matthew 20:1–16), a parable that is unique to Matthew's Gospel and connected directly to Peter's question at the end of chapter 19: "Behold, we have left everything and followed you. What then will we have?" (Matthew 19:27). The householder hires labourers at various hours — the first hour, the third, the sixth, the ninth, and even the eleventh — and at day's end pays them all the same wage: one denarius. The labourers who worked from dawn are outraged, and it is to one of these grumbling workers that the householder addresses the word Ἑταῖρε.

The theological gravity of this address cannot be overstated. The worker was not cheated. He received precisely what was agreed upon. His complaint was not born of injustice but of envy — the "evil eye" (ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, *ophthalmos ponēros*) mentioned in verse 15. He could not tolerate the master's generosity toward others. He felt that his longer service entitled him to *more* than those who came late. This is the spirit of religious self-entitlement: the conviction that seniority in religious practice creates a hierarchical claim upon God's grace.

The *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible* (1871) by Robert Jamieson, A.R. Fausset, and David Brown observes of verse 13: "Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny?" — and notes that the spirit of these murmurers is fundamentally a "calculating, mercenary spirit" that the parable is

designed "once for all to put down among the servants of Christ." The commentary further warns that "men who have wrought in Christ's service all their days may, by the spirit which they manifest at the last, make it too evident that, as between God and their own souls, they never were chosen workmen at all." This is a devastating observation: the one addressed as ἑταῖρε may have laboured all day, but his envious heart reveals that he was never truly a child of the master's household.

Matthew Henry, in his *Concise Commentary*, echoes this same insight, noting that the complaint of the first-hired reveals a misunderstanding of divine grace: God does not distribute His favour according to human calculations of merit, and those who insist upon such calculations expose their fundamental ignorance of the Gospel.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon, in his sermon *The Wedding Garment* — though commenting primarily on Matthew 22 — establishes a principle that applies equally to Matthew 20:13: "It is most needful in times of religious excitement, to remind men that godliness does not consist in profession, but must be proved by inward vitality and outward holiness." The worker who complained was not godly in his complaint; his profession of service had outstripped his possession of grace.

Gary Hamrick, in his sermon "Grace is Not Fair" on Matthew 20:1–16, draws the direct pastoral application: "Jesus teaches a parable in Matthew 20 to caution those who have gotten saved early in life not to be jealous of those who get saved late in life who receive the same eternal reward." This is an essential warning: those born into Christian households, raised in the church from infancy, catechised from childhood, must not fall into the deadly error of supposing that their religious pedigree gives them any superior claim upon God's grace over against those who come to faith late in life — the deathbed convert, the former atheist, the ex-criminal who finds Christ in prison. The denarius — eternal life — is the same for all.

John F. MacArthur, in his exposition of Matthew's Gospel, reinforces this warning against the "calculating, mercenary spirit" that supposes God owes something more to the long-serving believer. MacArthur has consistently taught that salvation is not wage-based but grace-based, and that the moment a believer begins to think of his service as earning something from God, he has abandoned the Gospel.

Derek Prince, in his teaching on "The Old Man vs. The New Man," warns that the root of religious self-entitlement is the uncircumcised heart — the "old self" that has never been crucified with Christ. The envious worker in Matthew 20 is a portrait of someone who serves God in the flesh rather than in the Spirit, whose religious activity is driven by self-interest rather than by love. Prince teaches: "God's remedy is execution of the old nature — the execution that took place when Jesus died on the cross for us." Until that old nature is executed, even a lifetime of religious service will produce the bitter fruit of envy and self-entitlement.

Ray Comfort, in his foundational teaching on true and false conversion, identifies this exact spirit as a hallmark of the false convert: one who has entered the visible church, who performs religious duties, who may even labour impressively in the vineyard — but whose heart has never been genuinely transformed. The false convert serves God for what God can give him, not out of love for God Himself. When the rewards seem inequitable, the false convert's true nature is exposed.

Voddie Baucham, in his proclamation of the doctrine of regeneration, teaches that being "born again" is entirely a sovereign act of God — "you can no more born yourself again than you born yourself the first time." The envious worker in the parable reveals himself to be one who has never experienced this supernatural regeneration, for the regenerate heart rejoices in the grace given to others rather than resenting it.

Bishop Robert Barron, in his commentary on the parables of Jesus, has consistently emphasised that the Kingdom of God operates according to a logic of grace that is fundamentally at odds with the logic of merit. The envious worker operates by the logic of merit; the master operates by the logic of grace. When these two logics collide, the one operating by merit is exposed as being outside the true spirit of the Kingdom, and thus the address ἑταῖρε — "friend" — functions as a word of distancing, not of embrace.

N.T. Wright, in his reflections on the parables, has observed that Jesus' parables consistently subvert expectations, particularly the expectation that God's kingdom will operate according to conventional human hierarchies of merit. The "first shall be last, and the last shall be first" (Matthew 20:16) is not merely a reversal of fortune but a revelation of the fundamental character of divine grace — a grace that is offensive to those who measure their standing before God by their own achievements.

Pastor Stephen Tong, the eminent Reformed Evangelical theologian, has warned in his proclamation of the Gospel that the most dangerous spiritual condition is that of religious people who have been in the church for many years yet have never truly understood grace. Such people, Tong argues, become the greatest opponents of the Gospel precisely because they believe their religious experience entitles them to something that new converts do not deserve.

[Jèrriais]

L'texte en Grec Koïné dé Matthieu 20:13 dit:

ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ἑνὶ αὐτῶν εἶπεν· Ἑταῖρε, οὐκ ἀδικῶ σε· οὐχὶ δηναρίου συνεφώνησάς μοι;

Translitéthâtion: *Ho de apokritheis heni autōn eipen: Hetaire, ouk adikō se; ouchi dēnariou synephōnēsas moi?*

Traduction: "Mais li, répondant à un d'ieux, dit: 'Anmîn, jé n'té fais pon d'tort. N'as-tu pon convenu auve mé pouor un dényi?'"

Ch'tchi vèrset-chîn stait dans la Parâbole des Ouvriers dans la Vîngne (Matthieu 20:1–16), eune parâbole tchi est unnique à l'Êvangile dé Matthieu et liée dithect'ment à la tchestion d'Piêrre à la fin du chapitre 19: "V'là, j'avons tout laîssi et t'avons suîvi. Tchi don éthons-j' en r'tou?" (Matthieu 19:27). L'maître d'la maiethon embauche des ouvriers à différhentes heuthes — la preunmiéthe heuthe, la troisiéme, la sixiéme, la neuviéme, et même la onziéme — et à la fin du jour i' les paie tous l'même gâge: un dényi. Les ouvriers tchi avaient travailli dépis l'aube sont îndignés, et ch'est à un d'ches-chîn, en traîn dé grouotter, qué l'maître d'la maiethon adresse l'mot Ἑταῖρε.

La gravité théologitchique d'chette adresse n'peut pon être surestîmée. L'ouvrier n'fut pon trompé. I' r'chut précîs'ment tchi qué fut convenu. Sa pliainnte n'était pon née dé l'injustice mais d'l'envie — l'"yi mauvais" (ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, *ophthalmos ponēros*) mentionné dans l'vèrset 15. I' n'pouvait pon supporter la générosité du maître envèrs les ôtres. I' sentait qué son long sèrvice li donnait drouait à *pus* qué tchés-là tchi avaient v'nu tardivement. Ch'est l'esprit d'l'orgueil rélîgieux: la conviction qué l'anciénneté dans la prâtique rélîgieuse crée eune prétention hiétharchique sus la grâce dé Dgieu.

L'*Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible* (1871) par Robert Jamieson, A.R. Fausset, et David Brown observe pouor l'vèrset 13 qué l'esprit d'ches grouotteurs est fondamentalement un "esprit mercenaithe et calculateu" qué la parâbole est conçue "eune bouonne fais pouor toutes à réduithe parmi les sèrviteurs dé Chrît." L'commentaithe avèrtit en outre qué "les houmes tchi ont travailli dans l'sèrvice dé Chrît tous lus jours pourraient, par l'esprit tch'ils manifestent à la fin, faithe trop clairement vé qué, entre Dgieu et lus âmes, i' n'furent janmais des ouvriers choisîns." Ch'est eune observation dévastante: chuîn tchi est adressé couôme ἑταῖρε pourrait aver travailli tout

l'jour, mais son tchoeu envieux rév'le tch'il n'a janmais été vrai'ment un êfant d'la maiethonnée du maître.

Gary Hamrick, dans son sèrmon "La Grâce n'est Pon Juste" sus Matthieu 20:1–16, tire l'application pastorâle dithect: "Jésus ensêgne eune parâbole dans Matthieu 20 pouor avèrti tchés-là tchi furent sauvés tôt dans lus vie dé n'pon être jaloux d'tchés-là tchi sont sauvés tard dans lus vie et r'chêvent la même récompense étèrnelle." Ch'est un avèrtiss'ment essentiel: tchés-là tchi sont nés dans des fanmil'yes chrétchiènes, êl'vés dans l'église dépis l'bèrcheau, catéchisés dépis l'enfance, n'doivent pon tomber dans l'èrreur mortelle dé supposer qué lus pédîgrée rélîgieux lus donne eune prétention supérieure sus la grâce dé Dgieu par-dessus tchés-là tchi vîndrent à la fé tard dans la vie.

L'Pasteur Stephen Tong, l'êmînent théologien rêformé êvangélitchue, a avèrti dans sa proclamâtion d'l'Êvangile qué la condîtion spirituelle la pus dangereuse est chelle des gens rélîgieux tchi ont été dans l'église pendant d'longues années et pourtant n'ont janmais vrai'ment compris la grâce. Dgieu n'paie pon sèlon nos calculs d'mérîte humain.

Derek Prince, dans son ensêgn'ment sus "L'Vièr Houme et l'Nouvé Houme," avèrtit qué la racine dé l'orgueil rélîgieux est l'tchoeu incirconcis — l'"vièr sé" tchi n'a janmais été crucifié auve Chrît. L'ouvrier envieux dans Matthieu 20 est un portrait d'tchitch'un tchi sèrt Dgieu dans la chèr pus tôt qué dans l'Esprit.

[中文]

馬太福音20:13的科因尼希臘文經文如下：

ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ἑνὶ αὐτῶν εἶπεν· Ἑταῖρε, οὐκ ἀδικῶ σε· οὐχὶ δηναρίου συνεφώνησάς μοι;

音譯：*Ho de apokritheis heni autōn eipen: Hetaire, ouk adikō se; ouchi dēnariou synephōnēsas moi?*

翻譯：「他回答其中一個人說：『朋友，我並沒有虧待你。你不是和我講定了一個銀幣嗎？』」

這節經文位於葡萄園工人的比喻（馬太福音20:1-16）之中，這個比喻是馬太福音所獨有的，且直接與彼得在第十九章末尾的問題相關：「看哪，我們已經撇下所有的跟從你，將來我們要得什麼呢？」（馬太福音19:27）。家主在不同的時辰——清晨、巳初（第三時辰）、午正（第六時辰）、申初（第九時辰），甚至酉初（第十一時辰）——僱用工人，然而到了日末，他付給他們所有人同樣的工資：一個銀幣。那些從清晨就開始工作的工人憤怒不已，而家主正是對其中一個發牢騷的工人使用了Ἑταῖρε這個稱呼。

這個稱呼的神學份量怎麼強調都不為過。這個工人並未受到欺騙。他所得到的恰恰是約定好的。他的抱怨並非源於不公義，而是源於嫉妒——第15節中提到的「紅眼病」（ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, *ophthalmos ponēros*，直譯「邪惡的眼」）。他無法容忍主人對他人的慷慨。他覺得自己較長時間的服事使他有權利比那些後來者得到更多。這就是宗教自以為有特權的精神：認為宗教實踐中的資歷可以對上帝的恩典建立等級性的要求。

傑米森、福塞特與布朗合著的《聖經全書批判與解經注釋》（1871年）在評論第13節時指出，這些抱怨者的精神根本上是一種「斤斤計較、唯利是圖的精神」，而這個比喻的目的就是要「在基督的僕人中一勞永逸地制止這種精神」。該注釋進一步警告：「在基督的事工中勞作了一輩子的人，可能由於他們最後所表現出的精神，使人看得太清楚了——在上帝與他們自己的靈魂之間，他們從來就不是蒙揀選的工人。」這是一個毀滅性的觀察：那個被稱為ἑταῖρε的人或許勞作了整天，但他嫉妒的心揭示了他從來都不是主人家庭中真正的孩子。

馬太·亨利在其《簡明注釋》中呼應了同樣的洞見，指出先被僱用者的抱怨揭示了他們對神聖恩典的根本性誤解：上帝並不按照人類對功績的計算來分配祂的恩惠，而那些堅持這種計算的人暴露了他們對福音的根本無知。

乾溪·漢姆瑞克（Gary Hamrick）在他關於馬太福音20:1-16的講道「恩典不公平」中，引出了直接的牧養應用：「耶穌在馬太福音20章中講了一個比喻，警告那些在生命早期得救的人，

不要嫉妒那些在生命晚期得救卻得到同樣永恆獎賞的人。」這是一個至關重要的警告：那些出生在基督教家庭中、從嬰孩時就在教會中長大、從小就接受教義問答訓練的人，絕不能陷入致命的錯誤，以為他們的宗教血統使他們比那些晚年才來到信仰中的人——臨終皈依者、前無神論者、在獄中找到基督的前罪犯——對上帝的恩典有更優越的權利。那一個銀幣——永恆的生命——對所有人都是一樣的。

約翰·麥克阿瑟（John F. MacArthur）在他對馬太福音的闡述中加強了這一警告，反對那種認為上帝欠長期服事之信徒更多的「斤斤計較、唯利是圖的精神」。約翰·麥克阿瑟一貫教導，救恩不是按工資計算的，而是按恩典賜予的。

葉光明（Derek Prince）在他關於「舊人與新人」的教導中警告說，宗教自以為有特權的根源是未受割禮的心——那從未與基督同釘十字架的「舊我」。葉光明教導：「上帝的救治方法是處死舊的本性——那在耶穌為我們死在十字架上時所發生的處決。」

唐崇榮牧師（Pastor Stephen Tong），這位傑出的改革宗福音派神學家，在他傳揚福音時警告說，最危險的屬靈狀態是那些在教會中待了許多年、卻從未真正理解恩典的宗教人士的狀態。唐牧師論證道，這樣的人恰恰成為福音最大的反對者，因為他們相信自己的宗教經歷使他們有權得到新信徒不配得的東西。

雷·乔福（Ray Comfort）在他關於真假歸信的基礎性教導中，正是將這種精神確認為假歸信者的標記：一個進入了有形教會、履行宗教責任、甚至可能在葡萄園中勞作得令人印象深刻的人——但其心從未真正被改變過。

伏迪·鮑肯（Voddie Baucham）在他宣講重生教義時教導，「重生」完全是上帝的主權作為——「你不可能自己讓自己重生，正如你不可能自己生出自己第一次。」比喻中那個嫉妒的工人暴露出自己是從未經歷過這種超自然重生的人，因為重生的心是為他人所得的恩典歡喜快樂，而不是因之心懷怨恨。

PART III: MATTHEW 22:12 — THE GARMENTLESS GUEST AND THE IMPERATIVE OF REGENERATION

TROISIÉME PARTIE: MATTHIEU 22:12 — L'ÎNVITÉ SANS VÊT'MENT ET L'IMPÉRATIF D'LA RÉGÉNÉTHÂTION

第三部分：馬太福音22:12——沒有禮服的客人與重生的必要性

[English]

The Koine Greek text of Matthew 22:12 reads:

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἑταῖρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου; ὁ δὲ ἐφιμώθη.

Transliteration: *Kai legei autō: Hetaire, pōs eisēlthes hōde mē echōn endyma gamou? Ho de ephimōthē.*

Translation: "And he said to him: 'Friend, how did you come in here not having a wedding garment?' And he was speechless."

This verse occurs within the Parable of the Wedding Banquet (Matthew 22:1–14), the climactic parable of a trilogy of judgment parables that Jesus delivered in the Temple on the Wednesday before His crucifixion. A king prepares a wedding feast for his son. The originally invited guests refuse to come; some ignore the invitation out of secular indifference, others murder the king's servants out of hostile enmity. The king destroys the murderers and burns their city — a prophetic reference, as MacArthur notes, to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70. New guests are then gathered from the highways — "both bad and good" (Matthew 22:10) — and the banquet hall is filled. But when the king enters to inspect the guests, he finds one man without the proper wedding garment. It is to this man that the king says: Ἑταῖρε.

The wedding garment (ἔνδυμα γάμου, *endyma gamou*) is the crux of the parable's theological message. What does it represent? The answer is found throughout the Scriptures: it is the "new self" — the regenerated nature — that every believer is called to "put on" after the crucifixion of the "old self." The Apostle Paul makes this explicit in Ephesians 4:22–24:

ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.

Transliteration: *Apothesthai hymas kata tēn proteran anastrophēn ton palaion anthrōpon ton phtheiromenon kata tas epithymias tēs apatēs, ananeousthai de tō pneumati tou noos hymōn, kai endysasthai ton kainon anthrōpon ton kata theon ktisthenta en dikaiosynē kai hosiotēti tēs alētheias.*

Translation: "That you put off, concerning your former conduct, the old man which grows corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that you put on the new man which was created according to God, in righteousness and true holiness."

And again in Colossians 3:9–10:

ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.

Transliteration: *Apekdysamenoi ton palaion anthrōpon syn tais praxesin autou, kai endysamenoi ton neon ton anakainoumenon eis epignōsin kat' eikona tou ktisantos auton.*

Translation: "Having put off the old man with his deeds, and having put on the new man who is being renewed in knowledge according to the image of Him who created him."

The verb ἐνδύω (*endyō*), "to put on" or "to clothe oneself with," is the same root that appears in Galatians 3:27: "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ (Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε, *Christon enedysasthe*)." The wedding garment is, in its fullest theological sense, Christ Himself — His righteousness, His nature, His life — "put on" by the believer through the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit. The one without the garment is one who has entered the visible assembly of God's people without having undergone the inward transformation of new birth.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon, in his magisterial sermon *The Wedding Garment* on Matthew 22:11–14, articulates this with characteristic force: "The wedding garment represents anything which is indispensable to a Christian, but which the unrenewed heart is not willing to accept." Spurgeon warns that the man without the garment "came only in appearance, he came not in heart. The banquet was intended for the honour of the son, but this man meant not so; he was willing to eat the good things, but he intended no respect to the prince." Spurgeon further elaborates: "In one word, we put on Christ, and He is 'made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.'" The garmentless guest is one who has refused to put on Christ — who remains clothed in his own "old self," his unregenerate nature, his self-made religion.

Spurgeon's most piercing observation is this: "There is a way to hell from the very gates of heaven." The garmentless guest was *inside* the banquet hall. He had accepted the invitation. He had taken a seat. Yet he was cast into "outer darkness" (σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, *skotos to exōteron*) — a term that, in the Matthean context, refers to the eschatological judgment of hell, characterised by "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (κλαυθμὸς καὶ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, *klauthmos kai brygmos tōn odontōn*). The

address ἑταῖρε thus marks not a friendly greeting but a judicial pronouncement: you are *not* family; you are *not* a child of the King; you are an intruder who must be expelled.

John MacArthur, in his sermon "Responding to a Royal Invitation," provides the christological interpretation of the garment: "The proper wedding garment of a true believer is God-imputed righteousness, without which no one can enter the kingdom." MacArthur stresses that "which marks a true believer is manifest righteousness, not that he hangs around other believers, not that he identifies externally with the ongoing activity of the kingdom." He refers to Isaiah 61:10 — "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, He hath covered me with a robe of righteousness" — as the Old Testament background to this parable's garment imagery.

Bishop Robert Barron, in his homily on "The Wedding Banquet," similarly stresses: "We must respond to the invitation, and we must don the proper wedding garment. Failure to do one or the other means we miss the celebration." The garment, for Barron, represents the total transformation of life that accompanies genuine reception of grace — not merely intellectual assent to the invitation, but the existential putting-on of a new identity in Christ.

Dr. Craig Keener, in his socio-rhetorical commentary on Matthew, notes that "Matthew leaves no doubt as to the interpretation: the wedding garment signifies repentance (3:2; 4:17)." The garment is thus not merely imputed righteousness in the forensic sense but the lived reality of a repentant, transformed life — the fruit of genuine regeneration.

Dr. Chuck Missler, in his verse-by-verse study of Matthew, connects the wedding garment directly to Romans 10:3, noting: "We will be standing before God by Jesus' righteousness, not our own." The garmentless guest is one who attempts to stand before God in his own righteousness — a self-righteous impostor who has never exchanged his filthy rags (Isaiah 64:6) for the robe of Christ's righteousness.

Derek Prince teaches with decisive clarity on this point: "God's remedy is to crucify the old man in Christ, let it be applied in us and God creates in us a new man which is the product of the truth as it is in Jesus." The wedding garment is the "new man" — the καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (*kainon anthrōpon*) — and the absence of the garment is the absence of regeneration itself. The one called ἑταῖρε in Matthew 22:12 is one who claims to be a Christian but has never let go of the "old self," has never been "born again" (γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, *gennēthē anōthen*, John 3:3), and therefore is not a child of God but merely an uninvited intruder at the family feast.

Vlad Savchuk, in his teaching on the crucified life, affirms: "When our old man was crucified, it was nailed on the cross. Jesus did not crucify our soul; He crucified our old nature." Savchuk emphasises that the new creation reality described in 2 Corinthians 5:17 — "If anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away; behold, the new has come" — is the defining mark of the authentic Christian. Without this new creation, one is the garmentless guest.

Jordan Peterson, speaking from a psychological-archetypal perspective on the figure of the man without the wedding garment, has noted that the refusal to transform — the insistence on remaining as one is while entering a sacred space that demands transformation — represents the deepest form of existential dishonesty. It is the refusal to die to what one was in order to become what one must be. Though Peterson's analysis is not confessionally theological, it resonates profoundly with the Christian doctrine of regeneration: the old self must die, and the new self must be born, or one stands exposed and speechless before the King.

[Jèrriais]

L'texte en Grec Koïné dé Matthieu 22:12 dit:

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἑταῖρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου; ὁ δὲ ἐφιμώθη.

Translitéthâtion: *Kai legei autō: Hetaire, pōs eisēlthes hōde mē echōn endyma gamou? Ho de ephimōthē.*

Traduction: "Et i' li dit: 'Anmîn, comment t'es-tu entré ichîn sans aver un vêt'ment d'nopces?' Et li fut r'ndu muet."

Ch'tchi vèrset occurre dans la Parâbole du Banquet d'Nopces (Matthieu 22:1–14). Un roi prépare un fête d'nopces pouor son fis. Les învités originaux r'fusent d'v'nîn; tchiques-uns ignorent l'invitation par indifféthence séculiéthe, d'ôtres meuthtrissent les sèrviteurs du roi par enmîtié hostile. L'roi détruit les meuthtrièrs et brûle lus ville. D'nouveaux învités sont ramassés des grands tchmîns — "les mauvais et les bouons" (Matthieu 22:10) — et la salle du banquet est emplie. Mais quand l'roi entre pouor examinné les învités, i' trouve un houme sans l'proprre vêt'ment d'nopces. Ch'est à ch't houme-chîn qué l'roi dit: Ἑταῖρε.

L'vêt'ment d'nopces (ἔνδυμα γάμου, *endyma gamou*) est l'noeud d'la théologie d'la parâbole. Tchi représente-t-i'? La réponse sé trouve dans toutes les Êcrituthes: ch'est l'"nouvé sé" — la natuthe régénéthée — qué châque criyant est app'lé à "mett' sus li" après la crucifixion du "vièr sé." L'Apôtre Paul l'fait êcliaithe dans Êphésiens 4:22–24 et Colossiens 3:9–10. L'vèrbe ἐνδύω (*endyō*), "mett' sus sé" ou "s'habîl'yer d'," est la même racine tchi apparaît dans Galates 3:27: "Car ous tous tchi avez été batisés en Chrît, ous avez r'vêtu Chrît (Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε, *Christon enedysasthe*)." L'vêt'ment d'nopces est, dans son sens théologitchue l'pus complet, Chrît Lui-même — Sa justiche, Sa natuthe, Sa vie — "r'vêtu" par l'criyant par l'oeuvre régénéthante du Saint-Esprit. Chuîn tchi est sans l'vêt'ment est un tchi est entré dans l'assembliée visible du peuple dé Dgieu sans aver subi la transformation întèrne d'la nouvelle naissance.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon, dans son sèrmon magistral *Le Vêt'ment d'Nopces*, articule chennechîn auve eune forche caractéristique: "L'vêt'ment d'nopces représente tout tchi

qué est indispensable à un Chrétchien, mais qué l'tchoeu non-renouvelé n'est pon dîsposé à accepter." Spurgeon avèrtit qué l'houme sans l'vêt'ment "vînt seulement en apparence, i' n'vînt pon en tchoeu." Et Spurgeon dit: "En un mot, j'mettons sus nous Chrît, et Il est 'fait par Dgieu pouor nous sagesse, justiche, sanctifîcâtion, et rédemption.'" L'învité sans vêt'ment est un tchi a r'fusé dé mett' sus li Chrît — tchi d'meuthe habîl'yé dans son propre "vièr sé."

L'observation la pus perchante dé Spurgeon est chette-chîn: "I' y a un tchmîn pouor l'enfer dépis les portes même du paradis." L'învité sans vêt'ment était *d'dans* la salle du banquet. I' avait accepté l'invitation. I' avait prîns sa pliaiche. Et portant i' fut jeté dans les "ténèbres extérieuthes" (σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, *skotos to exōteron*) — eune sorte d'enfer, caractérisé par "l'plieu et les grînchenments d'dents." L'adresse ἑταῖρε marque aînsîn pon une salutâtion anmîcale mais un prononcé judiciaithe: tu n'es *pon* d'la fanmil'ye; tu n'es *pon* un êfant du Roi; t'es un întrus tchi doit être expoulsé.

John MacArthur, dans son sèrmon "Répondre à eune Invitation Royale," donne l'intèrprétâtion christologitchue du vêt'ment: "L'vêt'ment d'nopces proprre d'un vrai criyant est la justiche impoutée par Dgieu, sans latchi personne n'peut entrer dans l'rouoyaume."

L'Évêque Robert Barron, dans son homélie sus "L'Banquet d'Nopces," soulîgne similairement: "J'devons répondre à l'invitation, et j'devons mett' l'proprre vêt'ment d'nopces. Manquer l'un ou l'ôtre signifie qué j'manquons la célébration."

Derek Prince ensêgne auve eune clièrté décisive sus ch'point: "L'remède dé Dgieu est dé crucifier l'vièr houme en Chrît, l'laîsser s'appliquer en nous, et Dgieu crée en nous un nouvé houme." L'vêt'ment d'nopces est l'"nouvé houme" — l'καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (*kainon anthrōpon*) — et l'absence du vêt'ment est l'absence d'la régénéthâtion elle-même.

[中文]

馬太福音22:12的科因尼希臘文經文如下：

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἑταῖρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου; ὁ δὲ ἐφιμώθη.

音譯：*Kai legei autō: Hetaire, pōs eisēlthes hōde mē echōn endyma gamou? Ho de ephimōthē.*

翻譯：「對他說：『朋友，你到這裡來怎麼不穿禮服呢？』那人無言可答。」

這節經文出現在婚宴的比喻（馬太福音22:1-14）中。一位王為他的兒子預備婚宴。原先受邀的客人拒絕前來；一些人出於世俗的冷漠忽視了邀請，另一些人出於敵意殺害了王的僕人。王消滅了兇手，燒毀了他們的城——正如約翰·麥克阿瑟所指出的，這是對主後七十年耶路撒冷被毀的預言性指涉。然後從大路上招來了新客人——「不論善惡」（馬太福音22:10）——筵席上就坐滿了客人。但當王進來觀看賓客時，他發現一個人沒有穿禮服。王正是對這人說了Ἑταῖρε。

禮服（ἔνδυμα γάμου, *endyma gamou*）是這個比喻神學信息的核心。它代表什麼？答案遍佈整本聖經：它就是「新人」——重生的本性——每個信徒在「舊我」被釘十字架之後都被呼召要「穿上」的。使徒保羅在以弗所書4:22-24中明確說明了這一點：

ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον..., καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον...

音譯：*Apothesthai hymas... ton palaion anthrōpon..., kai endysasthai ton kainon anthrōpon...*

翻譯：「就要脫去你們從前行為上的舊人……穿上新人，這新人是照著上帝的形像造的，有真理的仁義和聖潔。」

同樣在歌羅西書3:9-10：

ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον...

翻譯:「因你們已經脫去舊人和舊人的行為，穿上了新人。這新人在知識上漸漸更新，正如造他主的形像。」

動詞ἐνδύω（*endyō*），「穿上」或「以……為衣」，與加拉太書3:27中出現的是同一個詞根:「你們受洗歸入基督的都是披戴基督了（Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε, *Christon enedysasthe*）。」禮服在其最充分的神學意義上就是基督本身——祂的義、祂的性情、祂的生命——信徒通過聖靈的重生之工而「穿上」的。那沒有禮服的人，就是進入了上帝子民的有形聚會卻從未經歷內在新生轉化的人。

司布真（Charles Haddon Spurgeon）在他那篇論馬太福音22:11-14的宏偉講道《禮服》中，以其特有的力量清楚地闡明:「禮服代表一切對基督徒來說不可或缺的、但未更新之心不願意接受的事物。」司布真警告說，那沒有禮服的人「只是在外表上來了，他的心並未前來。宴席是為了尊榮王子而設的，但這人並非如此打算;他願意吃好東西，但他對王子毫無敬意。」司布真進一步闡述:「一言以蔽之，我們穿上基督，而祂是『上帝使祂成為我們的智慧、公義、聖潔、救贖。』」沒有禮服的客人就是拒絕穿上基督的人——仍然穿著自己的「舊我」、未重生的本性、自製的宗教。

司布真最尖銳的觀察是:「從天堂的大門口也有一條通往地獄的路。」那沒有禮服的客人在宴會廳裡面。他接受了邀請。他坐了下來。然而他被扔進了「外面的黑暗」（σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, *skotos to exōteron*）——在馬太福音的語境中，這指的是地獄的末世審判，其特徵是「哀哭切齒」（κλαυθμὸς καὶ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, *klauthmos kai brygmos tōn odontōn*）。因此，ἑταῖρε這個稱呼標誌的不是友好的問候，而是司法性的宣判:你不是家人;你不是王的孩子;你是必須被驅逐的入侵者。

約翰·麥克阿瑟在他的講道「回應皇家邀請」中，提供了禮服的基督論詮釋:「真信徒的合宜禮服乃是上帝所歸算的義，沒有這義，無人能進入天國。」麥克阿瑟強調「標誌真信徒的是彰顯出來的義，而不是他與其他信徒混在一起，也不是他外在地認同天國正在進行的活動。」他

引用以賽亞書61:10——「祂以拯救為衣給我穿上，以公義為袍給我披上」——作為這個比喻禮服意象的舊約背景。

羅伯特·巴倫主教（Bishop Robert Barron）在他關於「婚宴」的講道中同樣強調：「我們必須回應邀請，我們必須穿上合宜的禮服。兩者缺一不可，否則就錯過了慶典。」

克雷格·乞納博士（Dr. Craig Keener）在他對馬太福音的社會修辭學注釋中指出：「馬太對這個解釋毫無疑問：禮服象徵悔改（3:2; 4:17）。」

乞克·屯瑟博士（Dr. Chuck Missler）在他逐節研讀馬太福音時，將禮服直接與羅馬書10:3連結，指出：「我們將憑耶穌的義站在上帝面前，而不是憑我們自己的義。」

葉光明（Derek Prince）在這一點上教導得決定性地清晰：「上帝的救治是在基督裡釘死舊人，讓它應用在我們身上，而上帝在我們裡面創造一個新人。」禮服就是「新人」——καινὸν ἄνθρωπον（*kainon anthrōpon*）——而禮服的缺失就是重生本身的缺失。

弗拉德·薩夫丘克（Vlad Savchuk）在他關於被釘死之生命的教導中確認：「當我們的舊人被釘十字架時，他被釘在十字架上了。耶穌沒有釘死我們的靈魂；祂釘死的是我們的舊本性。」薩夫丘克強調哥林多後書5:17中所描述的新造的實際——「若有人在基督裡，他就是新造的人；舊事已過，都變成新的了」——是真正基督徒的界定標記。沒有這新造的實際，人就是那沒有禮服的客人。

約旦·彼得森（Jordan Peterson）從心理學原型的角度談到那個沒有禮服之人的形象時指出，拒絕轉變——堅持在一個要求轉變的神聖空間中保持原樣——代表著最深層的存在性不誠實。這是拒絕為了成為必須成為的而死去曾經的自己。雖然彼得森的分析並非信條式的神學分析，但它與基督教重生教義深刻地共鳴：舊我必須死去，新我必須被生出，否則人就赤裸暴露、無言以對地站在王的面前。

PART IV: MATTHEW 26:50 — THE BETRAYER DISOWNED

QUATRIÉME PARTIE: MATTHIEU 26:50 — L'TRAÎTE RÉNIÉ

第四部分：馬太福音26:50——叛徒被否認

[English]

The Koine Greek text of Matthew 26:50 reads:

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει. τότε προσελθόντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

Transliteration: *Ho de Iēsous eipen autō: Hetaire, eph' ho parei. Tote proselthontes epebalon tas cheiras epi ton Iēsoun kai ekratēsan auton.*

Translation: "And Jesus said to him: 'Friend, do what you came for.' Then they came forward, laid hands on Jesus, and seized Him."

This is the most dramatic and theologically dense of the three uses of ἑταῖρε. The setting is the Garden of Gethsemane, on the night of Jesus' arrest. Judas Iscariot — one of the Twelve, a man who had walked with Jesus for three years, who had been entrusted with the common purse, who had been sent out to preach and heal — comes with a crowd armed with swords and clubs, sent by the chief priests and elders. He approaches Jesus and kisses Him — the sign of betrayal — saying "Greetings, Rabbi!" (Χαῖρε, Ῥαββί, *Chaire, Rabbi*). And Jesus responds: Ἑταῖρε.

The use of ἑταῖρε here rather than ἀδελφέ (*adelphe*, "brother") or φίλε (*phile*, "beloved friend") is theologically devastating. Throughout His ministry, Jesus referred to His disciples in familial terms. In Matthew 12:49, He pointed to His disciples and said, "Here are my mother and my brothers" (ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου, *idou hē mētēr mou kai hoi adelphoi mou*). The disciples were His ἀδελφοί — His brothers, His family.

But at the moment of betrayal, Jesus does not call Judas ἀδελφέ. He calls him ἑταῖρε. The shift in address is the shift from kinship to exile, from family to outsider, from brother to mere "associate." At that moment, in that single word, Jesus verbally severs Judas from the spiritual family. Judas is no longer a brother of Christ. He is no longer a child of God. He is, at best, a "supposed friend" — and in reality, the ultimate impostor.

Matthew Henry, in his commentary on Matthew 26:50, observes: "He calls him 'friend'; not as owning him for one, but upbraiding him for being such a one as he had appeared to be." The word is thus not an expression of affection but of ironic judgment: you called yourself my friend, but your actions reveal what you truly are.

The *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible* (1871) by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown notes at Matthew 26:50 the profound restraint of Jesus' words: He neither curses Judas nor begs him to stop, but addresses him with a word that simultaneously reveals foreknowledge, sovereign control, and judicial distance. The ἑταῖρε is the word of a King who knows He is being betrayed and who permits the betrayal for the sake of the redemptive plan — but who also makes clear, in a single word, that the betrayer has placed himself outside the covenant community.

Jordan Peterson, in his extended reflections on the figure of Judas, has explored the psychology of betrayal with great depth. Peterson observes that "Judas was called Iscariot, meaning 'Betrayer.' And it's a betrayal of the principle of reciprocity and trust upon which society itself rests." For Peterson, Judas represents the archetypal betrayer — the one who, having been given intimate access to the highest good, sells it for the lowest price. The use of ἑταῖρε by Jesus, from Peterson's analytical framework, represents the divine naming of the betrayer's true identity: you are not what you pretended to be; you are exposed.

Dr. Michael S. Heiser, in his extensive work on the divine council and the "family of God" framework in Scripture, has shown that the concept of "sons of God" and "brothers and sisters of Christ" is not merely metaphorical but constitutes a real ontological reality within the divine household. To be called ἀδελφός (*adelphos*) by Christ is to be recognised as a member of this divine family — what Heiser calls the "supernatural family" that God is building through redemption. Judas' relegation from ἀδελφός to ἑταῖρος represents his expulsion from this family — a spiritual excommunication spoken by the Messiah Himself.

William Lane Craig, in his philosophical and theological reflections on divine foreknowledge, would note that Jesus' use of ἑταῖρε does not represent a sudden discovery of Judas' treachery but the culmination of divine omniscience meeting human free will at the appointed hour. Jesus always knew (John 6:64), yet He allowed Judas to walk with Him, to hear the teaching, to witness the miracles — giving him every opportunity to repent. The word ἑταῖρε at Gethsemane is the final, irreversible pronouncement that Judas has chosen his path and that the door of brotherhood is now closed.

Cliffe Knechtle, in his campus apologetics, has frequently addressed the nature of genuine versus nominal Christianity. The case of Judas is the ultimate illustration of Knechtle's insistence that proximity to Christ does not equal possession of Christ. Judas was physically closer to Jesus than any pope, any bishop, any pastor has ever been — and yet he was lost. As Knechtle would say: "It is not a religion. You must have a personal conversion, be born again, to be a true Christian."

[Jèrriais]

L'texte en Grec Koïné dé Matthieu 26:50 dit:

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει. τότε προσελθόντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

Translitéthâtion: *Ho de Iēsous eipen autō: Hetaire, eph' ho parei. Tote proselthontes epebalon tas cheiras epi ton Iēsoun kai ekratēsan auton.*

Traduction: "Et Jésus li dit: 'Anmîn, fais tchi qué t'es v'nu pouor.' Adonc i' vîndrent, mîtent les mains sus Jésus, et L'arrêtèrent."

Ch'est la pus dramatique et la pus théologitchement dense des trais emplyeis d'ἑταῖρε. La sèrne est l'Gardîn dé Gethsémané, la niet dé l'arrêt dé Jésus. Judas Iscariot — un des Douze, un houme tchi avait marchi auve Jésus pendant trais ans, à tchi l'on avait confié la bourse commune, tchi avait été envoyé pouor prêchi et guéri — vînt auve eune troupe armée d'êpées et d'bâtons, envoyée par les grands prêtres et les anciens. I' s'approche dé Jésus et L'embrasse — l'sîngne d'la trahison — dîthant "Salut, Rabbi!" (Χαῖρε, Ῥαββί, *Chaire, Rabbi*). Et Jésus répond: Ἑταῖρε.

L'emplyei d'ἑταῖρε ichîn pus tôt qu'ἀδελφέ (*adelphe*, "fréthe") ou φίλε (*phile*, "chièr anmîn") est théologitchement dévastant. Tout l'long d'Son ministéthe, Jésus faisait référence à Ses dîsciples en tèrmes fanmiliaux. Dans Matthieu 12:49, I' montra Ses dîsciples et dit, "V'là ma méthe et mes frêthes." Les dîsciples étaient Ses ἀδελφοί — Ses frêthes, Sa fanmil'ye. Mais au moment d'la trahison, Jésus n'app'le pon Judas ἀδελφέ. I' l'app'le ἑταῖρε. L'chang'ment d'adresse est l'chang'ment d'la parenté à l'exil, d'la fanmil'ye à l'étrangiéthe, du fréthe au sîmple "associé." En ch'moment-là, dans ch'mot seul, Jésus coupe vèrbalement Judas d'la fanmil'ye spirituelle. Judas n'est pus un fréthe dé Chrît. I' n'est pus un êfant dé Dgieu. Il est, au mieux, un "faux anmîn" — et en réalité, l'împosteux ultîme.

Matthew Henry, dans son commentaithe sus Matthieu 26:50, observe: "Il l'app'le 'anmîn'; pon couôme l'r'connaissant pouor un, mais l'réprîmandant pouor être tel qu'il

avait paru être." L'mot n'est aînsîn pon eune expression d'affection mais d'jugement ironique.

Jordan Peterson, dans ses réflexions étendues sus la figuthe dé Judas, a exploré la psychologie d'la trahison auve eune grande profondeur. Peterson observe qué "Judas fut app'lé Iscariot, signifiant 'Traître.' Et ch'est eune trahison du prîncipe dé réciprocité et d'confiance sus latchi la société elle-même repose."

L'Docteur Michael S. Heiser, dans son travail étendu sus l'consé divin et la châpente d'la "fanmil'ye dé Dgieu" dans les Êcrituthes, a montré qué l'concept d'"fis dé Dgieu" et "frêthes et soeurs dé Chrît" n'est pon seulement métaphorique mais constitue eune réalité ontologitchue au sein d'la maiethonnée divine. Être app'lé ἀδελφός (*adelphos*) par Chrît ch'est être r'connu couôme un membre d'chette fanmil'ye divine. La rélégâtion dé Judas d'ἀδελφός à ἑταῖρος représente son expulsion d'chette fanmil'ye — eune excommunicâtion spirituelle prononcée par l'Messie Lui-même.

[中文]

馬太福音26:50的科因尼希臘文經文如下：

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει. τότε προσελθόντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

音譯：*Ho de Iēsous eipen autō: Hetaire, eph' ho parei. Tote proselthontes epebalon tas cheiras epi ton Iēsoun kai ekratēsan auton.*

翻譯：「耶穌對他說：『朋友，你來要做的事，就做吧。』於是那些人上前，下手拿住了耶穌。」

這是ἑταῖρε三次使用中最戲劇性、神學內涵最豐富的一次。場景是客西馬尼園，耶穌被捕的那個夜晚。加略人猶大——十二門徒之一，一個與耶穌同行三年的人，被託管公款的人，被差遣出去傳道和醫治的人——帶著一群手持刀棍的人來了，他們是大祭司和長老派來的。

他走近耶穌，親吻祂——背叛的暗號——說「拉比，你好！」（Χαῖρε, Ῥαββί, *Chaire, Rabbi*）。而耶穌回答：Ἑταῖρε。

在這裡使用ἑταῖρε而非ἀδελφέ（*adelphe*，「弟兄」）或φίλε（*phile*，「摯友」），在神學上是毀滅性的。在祂整個事工期間，耶穌以家人的用語稱呼祂的門徒。在馬太福音12:49中，祂指著門徒說：「看哪，我的母親，我的弟兄。」（ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου, *idou hē mētēr mou kai hoi adelphoi mou*）。門徒們是祂的ἀδελφοί——祂的弟兄，祂的家人。然而在背叛的時刻，耶穌並不稱猶大為ἀδελφέ。祂稱他為ἑταῖρε。稱呼的轉變就是從血親到流亡、從家人到外人、從弟兄到僅僅是「相識者」的轉變。在那一刻，在那一個詞中，耶穌以言語將猶大從屬靈家庭中切斷。猶大不再是基督的弟兄。他不再是上帝的兒女。他充其量是一個「假朋友」——而實際上，是終極的冒充者。

馬太·亨利在他對馬太福音26:50的注釋中觀察到：「祂稱他為『朋友』；不是承認他是朋友，而是責備他竟然成了他所表現出來的那種人。」因此這個詞不是情感的表達，而是帶有諷刺意味的審判：你自稱是我的朋友，但你的行為揭示了你的真面目。

傑米森、福塞特與布朗合著的《聖經全書批判與解經注釋》（1871年）在馬太福音26:50處指出耶穌話語中的深邃克制：祂既不咒詛猶大，也不懇求他停手，而是用一個詞同時揭示了預知、主權的掌控和司法的距離。ἑταῖρε是一位知道自己正在被背叛、並為了救贖計畫的緣故而允許這背叛發生的王所說的話——但祂也在這一個詞中清楚地表明，背叛者已經將自己置於盟約群體之外。

約旦·彼得森在他對猶大形象的深入反思中探索了背叛的心理學。彼得森觀察到：「猶大被稱為加略人，意思是『背叛者』。這是對社會本身所賴以建立的互惠與信任原則的背叛。」對彼得森來說，猶大代表了原型性的背叛者——那個被給予了接近最高善的親密機會、卻以最低的價格出賣它的人。

邁克爾·海瑟博士（Dr. Michael S. Heiser）在他關於神聖議會和聖經中「上帝的家庭」框架的廣泛著作中，展示了「上帝的兒子」和「基督的弟兄姊妹」的概念不僅僅是隱喻，而是構成神聖家庭中真實的本體論實際。被基督稱為ἀδελφός（*adelphos*）就是被承認為這神聖家庭的

成員——海瑟稱之為上帝通過救贖正在建造的「超自然家庭」。猶大從ἀδελφός被降格為ἑταῖρος，代表他從這個家庭中被驅逐——一次由彌賽亞親自宣告的屬靈逐出。

威廉·連·克雷格（William Lane Craig）在他對神聖預知的哲學和神學反思中會指出，耶穌使用ἑταῖρε並非代表突然發現猶大的詭計，而是神聖的全知與人的自由意志在預定的時刻相遇的高潮。耶穌始終知道（約翰福音6:64），然而祂允許猶大與祂同行、聆聽教導、見證神蹟——給他每一個悔改的機會。在客西馬尼園的ἑταῖρε一詞，是猶大已選定其道路、弟兄之門現已關閉的最終、不可逆轉的宣判。

柯立弗·奈赫特（Cliffe Knechtle）在他的校園護教中，經常論及真正的基督教與掛名的基督教之間的本質區別。猶大的案例是奈赫特堅持之論點的終極例證：與基督的接近並不等於擁有基督。猶大在肉身上比任何教宗、任何主教、任何牧師都更接近耶穌——然而他卻失喪了。正如奈赫特所說：「這不是一個宗教。你必須有個人的皈依，必須重生，才能成為真正的基督徒。」

PART V: MATTHEW 12:48–50 — THE CRITERION OF TRUE KINSHIP WITH CHRIST

CHÎNQUIÉME PARTIE: MATTHIEU 12:48–50 — L'CRÎTÉTHE D'LA VRAIE PARENTÉ AUVE CHRÎT

第五部分：馬太福音12:48-50——與基督真正親屬關係的標準

[English]

Having established that ἑταῖρε functions as a word of divine rejection — marking the addressee as *not* a true member of Christ's family — we must now turn to the passage where Jesus Himself defines the criterion for genuine kinship. The Koine Greek text of Matthew 12:48–50 reads:

v.48: ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ· Τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;

Transliteration: *Ho de apokritheis eipen tō legonti autō: Tis estin hē mētēr mou, kai tines eisin hoi adelphoi mou?*

Translation: "But He answered and said to the one who told Him: 'Who is My mother, and who are My brothers?'"

v.49: καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.

Transliteration: *Kai ekteinas tēn cheira autou epi tous mathētas autou eipen: Idou hē mētēr mou kai hoi adelphoi mou.*

Translation: "And stretching out His hand toward His disciples, He said: 'Behold, My mother and My brothers!'"

v.50: ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

Transliteration: *Hostis gar an poiēsē to thelēma tou patros mou tou en ouranois, autos mou adelphos kai adelphē kai mētēr estin.*

Translation: "For whoever does the will of My Father who is in heaven, that one is My brother (ἀδελφός, *adelphos*) and sister (ἀδελφή, *adelphē*) and mother (μήτηρ, *mētēr*)."

This passage is the hermeneutical key that unlocks the full significance of ἑταῖρε in the three passages we have examined. Jesus draws an absolute distinction between those who are His family and those who are not. The criterion is singular, clear, and non-negotiable: doing the will of the Father. The word used is not ἑταῖρος but ἀδελφός

— brother — the word of genuine kinship, of real belonging, of actual inclusion in the divine family.

The implications are profound: the envious worker of Matthew 20:13 is not doing the will of the Father, for the Father's will is grace, and the worker resents grace. The garmentless guest of Matthew 22:12 is not doing the will of the Father, for the Father's will is regeneration — the putting on of the new self — and the guest has refused this transformation. Judas Iscariot of Matthew 26:50 is not doing the will of the Father, for the Father's will is faithfulness to the Son, and Judas has sold the Son for thirty pieces of silver. In every case, the ἑταῖρε fails the Matthew 12:50 test. Each has outward association with Jesus but lacks the inward reality of obedient relationship with the Father. Each is a "friend" but not a "brother." Each is associated but not adopted. Each is proximate but not kin.

Dr. Michael S. Heiser's framework of the "divine family" illuminates this further. In Heiser's reading of the biblical narrative, God's overarching purpose from Eden onward is the creation of a divine-human family — a household in which redeemed human beings are elevated to the status of "sons and daughters of God," brothers and sisters of the incarnate Son. To be called ἀδελφός by Christ is to be included in this cosmic family project. To be called ἑταῖρε is to be revealed as one who has not entered it.

N.T. Wright's theology of "new creation" is equally relevant here. For Wright, the death and resurrection of Jesus inaugurates a new creation — a new world in which human beings are not merely forgiven but genuinely transformed. The "wedding garment" of Matthew 22 and the "new man" of Ephesians 4 are both expressions of this new-creation reality. The one who is in Christ is a "new creation" (2 Corinthians 5:17); the one who remains in the "old self" has not entered the new creation and therefore cannot be called a brother or sister of the risen Christ.

Alvin Plantinga, in his philosophical theology, argues that genuine belief in God involves not merely intellectual assent but what he calls a "properly basic" knowledge of God produced by the *sensus divinitatis* — an inner faculty designed by God to produce true belief. The garmentless guest might represent one who has the outward form of belief but lacks this inner reality — one whose "belief" is merely sociological rather than genuinely spiritual. Such a person is, in Plantinga's terms, one in whom the *sensus divinitatis* has been suppressed or corrupted, and who therefore cannot produce the fruit of genuine faith.

The Patristic and Catholic tradition, as represented by scholars such as Dr. Karlo Broussard and Dr. John Bergsma, understands the wedding garment in sacramental terms as well — as the grace of baptism and the Eucharist, which clothe the believer in Christ's righteousness. The garmentless guest, in this reading, is one who has received the sacraments outwardly but has not allowed sacramental grace to effect the interior transformation that the sacraments signify. The importance of genuine interior conversion alongside sacramental reception is a theme emphasised also by Abbé Chris Alar, Abbé Donald Calloway, and Abbé Carlos Martins in their work on authentic Marian devotion and genuine conversion of heart.

Robby Gallaty, in his ministry of discipleship, has consistently taught that the mark of a genuine disciple is not mere church attendance or theological knowledge but the transformation of life that flows from a genuine encounter with the risen Christ. The disciple is one who does the will of the Father — not perfectly, but genuinely, out of a transformed heart.

Nate Sala, in his apologetics ministry, brings an important epistemological dimension: the difference between knowing *about* Christ and knowing Christ is the difference between ἑταῖρος and ἀδελφός. The former is intellectual proximity without relational reality; the latter is the experiential knowledge that comes from genuine spiritual union.

[Jèrriais]

Ayant êtabli qué ἑταῖρε fonctionne couôme un mot dé r'jection divine — marquant l'adressé couôme *pon* un vrai membre d'la fanmil'ye dé Chrît — j'devons maintenant nous touônner vèrs l'passage ouoù Jésus Lui-même définit l'crîtéthe d'la véthitable parenté. L'texte en Grec Koïné dé Matthieu 12:48–50 dit:

v.48: ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ· Τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;

Traduction: "Mais Il répondit à chuîn tchi li dit: 'Tchi est Ma méthe, et tchi sont Mes frêthes?'"

v.49: καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.

Traduction: "Et étendant Sa main vèrs Ses dîsciples, Il dit: 'V'là Ma méthe et Mes frêthes!'"

v.50: ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

Traduction: "Car quiconque fait la volonté dé Mon Péthe tchi est dans les cieux, chuîn-là est Mon fréthe (ἀδελφός, *adelphos*) et Ma soeu (ἀδελφή, *adelphē*) et Ma méthe (μήτηρ, *mētēr*)."

Ch'tchi passage est la clé herméneutique tchi ouvre la pleine significâtion d'ἑταῖρε dans les trais passages qué j'avons examiné. Jésus tire eune distinction absolue entre tchés-là tchi sont Sa fanmil'ye et tchés-là tchi n'le sont pon. L'crîtéthe est sîngulier, clièr, et non-négociable: faithe la volonté du Péthe. L'mot emplyé n'est pon ἑταῖρος mais ἀδελφός — fréthe — l'mot d'la véthitable parenté, d'la vraie appartenance, d'l'inclusion actuelle dans la fanmil'ye divine.

Les implications sont profondes: l'ouvrier envieux dé Matthieu 20:13 n'fait pon la volonté du Péthe, car la volonté du Péthe est la grâce, et l'ouvrier r'sent la grâce. L'învité sans vêt'ment dé Matthieu 22:12 n'fait pon la volonté du Péthe, car la volonté du Péthe est la régénéthâtion — l'r'vêtement du nouvé sé — et l'învité a r'fusé chette transformation. Judas Iscariot dé Matthieu 26:50 n'fait pon la volonté du Péthe, car la volonté du Péthe est la fidélité au Fis, et Judas a vendu l'Fis pouor trente pièches d'argent. Dans châque cas, l'ἑταῖρε manque au test dé Matthieu 12:50.

L'Docteur Michael S. Heiser sa châpente d'la "fanmil'ye divine" écliaithe chennechîn davantage. Dans la léctuthe dé Heiser du récit biblique, l'but suprême dé Dgieu dépis l'Êden en avant est la créâtion d'eune fanmil'ye divine-humaine — eune maiethonnée dans latchi les êtres humains rachetés sont êl'vés au statut d'"fis et fil'yes dé Dgieu." Être app'lé ἀδελφός par Chrît ch'est être înclus dans ch'tchi projet famill'ya cosmique. Être app'lé ἑταῖρε ch'est être rév'lé couôme un tchi n'y est pon entré.

La théologie d'N.T. Wright d'la "nouvelle créâtion" est êgalement pertinente ichîn. Pouor Wright, la mort et la résurrection dé Jésus inaugurent eune nouvelle créâtion — un nouvé monde dans létchi les êtres humains n'sont pon seulement pardonnés mais véthitablement transformés. Chuîn tchi est en Chrît est eune "nouvelle créâtion" (2 Corinthiens 5:17); chuîn tchi d'meuthe dans l'"vièr sé" n'est pon entré dans la nouvelle créâtion et n'peut don pon être app'lé un fréthe ou eune soeu du Chrît r'ssuscité.

Alvin Plantinga, dans sa théologie philosophique, argue qué la véthitable criyance en Dgieu învolve pon seulement l'assentiment întellectuel mais tchi qu'il app'le eune connaissance "proprement basique" dé Dgieu produite par l'*sensus divinitatis*. L'învité sans vêt'ment pourrait représenter chuîn tchi a la forme extèrne d'la criyance mais manque d'chette réalité întèrne.

Robby Gallaty, dans son ministéthe dé dîsciplat, a consistament ensêgné qué la marque d'un véthitable dîsciple n'est pon la sîmple fréquentâtion d'l'église mais la transformation d'la vie tchi coule d'eune véthitable rencontre auve l'Chrît r'ssuscité.

[中文]

在確立了ἑταῖρε作為神聖拒絕之詞——標記被稱呼者不是基督家庭的真正成員——之後，我們現在必須轉向耶穌親自定義真正血親標準的那段經文。馬太福音12:48-50的科因尼希臘文經文如下：

v.48: ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ· Τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;

音譯：*Ho de apokritheis eipen tō legonti autō: Tis estin hē mētēr mou, kai tines eisin hoi adelphoi mou?*

翻譯：「祂回答那告訴祂的人說：『誰是我的母親？誰是我的弟兄？』」

v.49: καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν· Ἴδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.

音譯：*Kai ekteinas tēn cheira autou epi tous mathētas autou eipen: Idou hē mētēr mou kai hoi adelphoi mou.*

翻譯：「就伸手指著門徒說：『看哪，我的母親，我的弟兄。』」

v.50: ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

音譯：*Hostis gar an poiēsē to thelēma tou patros mou tou en ouranois, autos mou adelphos kai adelphē kai mētēr estin.*

翻譯：「因為凡遵行我天父旨意的人，就是我的弟兄（ἀδελφός, *adelphos*）、姊妹（ἀδελφή, *adelphē*）和母親（μήτηρ, *mētēr*）了。」

這段經文是解開我們所考察的三段經文中ἑταῖρε全部意義的釋經鑰匙。耶穌在那些是祂家人的人和那些不是祂家人的人之間劃下了絕對的界線。標準是單一的、清晰的、不可談判的：遵行天父的旨意。所使用的詞不是ἑταῖρος，而是ἀδελφός——弟兄——真正血親的詞彙，真正歸屬的詞彙，實際被納入神聖家庭的詞彙。

其含意是深遠的：馬太福音20:13中那嫉妒的工人沒有遵行天父的旨意，因為天父的旨意是恩典，而那工人怨恨恩典。馬太福音22:12中那沒有禮服的客人沒有遵行天父的旨意，因為天父的旨意是重生——穿上新我——而那客人拒絕了這種轉化。馬太福音26:50中的加略人猶大沒有遵行天父的旨意，因為天父的旨意是忠於聖子，而猶大為了三十塊銀錢出賣了聖子。在每一個案例中，ἑταῖρε都未能通過馬太福音12:50的測試。每一位都與耶穌有外在的聯繫，但缺乏與天父之間順服關係的內在實際。每一位都是「朋友」但不是「弟兄」。每一位都是聯繫者但不是被收養者。每一位都近在咫尺但不是家人。

邁克爾·海瑟博士的「神聖家庭」框架進一步闡明了這一點。在海瑟對聖經敘事的解讀中，上帝從伊甸園開始的首要目的是創建一個神聖的人間家庭——一個被救贖的人類被提升到「上帝的兒女」地位、成為道成肉身之子的弟兄姊妹的家族。被基督稱為ἀδελφός就是被納入這個宇宙性的家庭計畫。被稱為ἑταῖρε就是被揭示為尚未進入其中的人。

N.T.賴特（N.T. Wright）的「新造」神學在此同樣具有相關性。對賴特而言，耶穌的死與復活開啟了一個新造——一個人類不僅僅被赦免而是真正被改變的新世界。馬太福音22章的「禮服」和以弗所書4章的「新人」都是這新造實際的表達。在基督裡的就是「新造的人」（哥林多後書5:17）；仍留在「舊我」中的則未進入新造，因此不能被稱為復活之基督的弟兄或姊妹。

阿爾文·普蘭丁格（Alvin Plantinga）在他的哲學神學中論證，對上帝的真正信仰不僅僅涉及理智的認同，而是他所稱的由感知神性之官能（*sensus divinitatis*）所產生的對上帝「恰當基本」的認識。那沒有禮服的客人可能代表一個擁有信仰的外在形式卻缺乏這內在實際的人。

羅比·加勒蒂（Robby Gallaty）在他的門訓事工中一貫教導，真門徒的標記不是單純的參加教會或神學知識，而是從與復活之基督的真實相遇中流淌出來的生命轉化。

內特·薩拉（Nate Sala）在他的護教事工中帶來了一個重要的知識論維度：知道關於基督和認識基督之間的區別，就是ἑταῖρος和ἀδελφός之間的區別。前者是沒有關係實際的理智接近；後者是來自真正屬靈聯合的經驗性認識。

布儒薩爾博士（Dr. Karlo Broussard）和伯格斯瑪博士（Dr. John Bergsma）所代表的教父和天主教傳統，也從聖事的角度理解禮服——作為洗禮和聖體聖事的恩典，以基督的義為信徒披上。在這種解讀中，沒有禮服的客人是外在地領受了聖事、卻未讓聖事的恩典在內心產生聖事所象徵的內在轉化的人。真正的內在皈依與聖事領受並行的重要性，也是亞拉爾神父（Chris Alar神父）、卡洛韋神父（Donald Calloway神父）和馬丁斯神父（Carlos Martins神父）在他們關於真正的聖母敬禮和真心悔改的著作中所強調的主題。

PART VI: CONCLUSION — THE CHASM BETWEEN ἑταῖρε AND ἀδελφέ

SIXIÉME PARTIE: CONCLUSION — L'GOUFFRE ENTRE ἑταῖρε ET ἀδελφέ

第六部分：結論——ἑταῖρε與ἀδελφέ之間的鴻溝

[English]

The three occurrences of ἑταῖρε in Matthew's Gospel form a devastating triptych of divine rejection. In Matthew 20:13, the envious worker is rejected because he does not understand grace and presumes upon seniority — a warning to all who are born into Christianity and suppose their religious pedigree entitles them to more than those who convert later. In Matthew 22:12, the garmentless guest is rejected because he has entered the visible church without undergoing regeneration — a warning to all who claim the name of Christ but have never "put off the old self" and "put on the new self," never been born again — and their end is "outer darkness," which is hell. In Matthew

26:50, Judas Iscariot is rejected because he has betrayed the Son of God — and in that single word ἑταῖρε, Jesus severs him from the spiritual family, no longer calling him "brother" but merely "associate."

Against these three stands the glorious standard of Matthew 12:48–50: whoever does the will of the Father is Christ's ἀδελφός, ἀδελφή, and μήτηρ — brother, sister, and mother. This is the path from ἑταῖρε to ἀδελφέ: not religious pedigree, not external association, not proximity of position, but the genuine, Spirit-wrought transformation of the inner self through repentance, faith, and obedience to the will of the Father.

As Spurgeon thundered: "There is a way to hell from the very gates of heaven." As MacArthur warned: the mark of a true believer is manifest righteousness, not external identification. As Derek Prince taught: God's remedy for the old self is crucifixion — the Cross applied to our nature. As Ray Comfort insists: there is a categorical difference between true and false conversion. As Voddie Baucham declares: regeneration is God's sovereign act — not man's achievement. As Bishop Robert Barron reminds us: we must both accept the invitation *and* put on the garment. As N.T. Wright proclaims: in Christ, a new creation has begun, and only those clothed in that new creation are truly family.

The question that this essay poses to every reader is therefore the question of the King Himself: ἑταῖρε, or ἀδελφέ? Are you merely associated with Christ, or have you been adopted into His family? Have you put on the wedding garment of the new self, or do you stand in the banquet hall in the rags of the old? Do you do the will of the Father — not perfectly, but genuinely, from a heart that has been broken and remade by the Holy Spirit?

For "many are called, but few are chosen" (πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, *polloi gar eisin klētoi, oligoi de eklektoi*, Matthew 22:14).

[Jèrriais]

Les trais occurrences d'ἑταῖρε dans l'Êvangile dé Matthieu forment un triptique dévastant dé r'jection divine. Dans Matthieu 20:13, l'ouvrier envieux est r'jeté pathce qu'il n'comprend pon la grâce et présume sus l'anciénneté — un avèrtiss'ment à tous tchés-là tchi sont nés dans l'Chrétchienneté et supposent qué lus pédîgrée rélîgieux les autorise à pus qué tchés-là tchi sé convèrtissent tard. Dans Matthieu 22:12, l'învité sans vêt'ment est r'jeté pathce qu'il est entré dans l'église visible sans aver subi la régénéthâtion — un avèrtiss'ment à tous tchés-là tchi rêcliament l'nom dé Chrît mais n'ont janmais "ôté l'vièr sé" et "r'vêtu l'nouvé sé," janmais été nés d'nouvé — et lus fin est les "ténèbres extérieuthes," tchi est l'enfer. Dans Matthieu 26:50, Judas Iscariot est r'jeté pathce qu'il a trahi l'Fis dé Dgieu — et dans ch'seul mot ἑταῖρε, Jésus l'coupe d'la fanmil'ye spirituelle, n'l'app'lant pus "fréthe" mais seulement "associé."

Contre ches trais sé tînt la glorieuse norme dé Matthieu 12:48–50: quiconque fait la volonté du Péthe est l'ἀδελφός, l'ἀδελφή, et la μήτηρ dé Chrît — fréthe, soeu, et méthe. Ch'est l'tchmîn d'l'ἑταῖρε à l'ἀδελφέ: pon l'pédîgrée rélîgieux, pon l'association extèrne, pon la proximité d'position, mais la véthitable transformation d'l'être întérieur, oeuvré par l'Esprit, par la repentance, la fé, et l'obéissance à la volonté du Péthe.

Couôme Spurgeon tonna: "I' y a un tchmîn pouor l'enfer dépis les portes même du paradis." Couôme John MacArthur avèrtit: la marque d'un vrai criyant est la justiche manifeste. Couôme Derek Prince ensêgna: l'remède dé Dgieu pouor l'vièr sé est la crucifixion. Couôme l'Évêque Robert Barron nous rapp'le: j'devons accepter l'invitation *et* r'vêtir l'vêt'ment.

La tchestion qué ch't essai pose à châque liétheux est aînsîn la tchestion du Roi Lui-même: ἑταῖρε, ou ἀδελφέ? Êtes-ous sîmpliément associé auve Chrît, ou avez-ous été adopté dans Sa fanmil'ye? Avez-ous r'vêtu l'vêt'ment d'nopces du nouvé sé, ou êtes-ous d'bout dans la salle du banquet dans les haillons du vièr?

Car "bein des gens sont app'lés, mais peu sont choisîns" (πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, *polloi gar eisin klētoi, oligoi de eklektoi*, Matthieu 22:14).

[中文]

ἑταῖρε在馬太福音中的三次出現，構成了神聖拒絕的毀滅性三聯畫。在馬太福音20:13中，嫉妒的工人被拒絕，因為他不理解恩典，卻僭越地憑藉資歷——這是對所有生在基督教中、自以為其宗教血統使他們比後來皈依者有更多權利之人的警告。在馬太福音22:12中，沒有禮服的客人被拒絕，因為他進入了有形的教會卻未經歷重生——這是對所有宣稱基督之名卻從未「脫去舊人」和「穿上新人」、從未重生之人的警告——他們的結局是「外面的黑暗」，即地獄。在馬太福音26:50中，加略人猶大被拒絕，因為他背叛了上帝的兒子——在ἑταῖρε這一個詞中，耶穌將他從屬靈家庭中切斷，不再稱他為「弟兄」而僅僅稱他為「相識者」。

與這三者相對的是馬太福音12:48-50的榮耀標準：凡遵行天父旨意的，就是基督的ἀδελφός、ἀδελφή和μήτηρ——弟兄、姊妹和母親。這就是從ἑταῖρε到ἀδελφέ的道路：不是宗教血統，不是外在聯繫，不是位置的接近，而是通過悔改、信心和順服天父旨意，由聖靈做成的內在自我的真正轉化。

正如司布真所雷鳴般宣告的：「從天堂的大門口也有一條通往地獄的路。」正如約翰·麥克阿瑟所警告的：真信徒的標記是彰顯出來的義，而非外在的認同。正如葉光明所教導的：上帝對舊我的救治是釘十字架——將十字架應用於我們的本性。正如雷·乔福所堅持的：真歸信與假歸信之間有本質的區別。正如伏迪·鮑肯所宣告的：重生是上帝的主權作為——不是人的成就。正如羅伯特·巴倫主教所提醒我們的：我們必須既接受邀請，又穿上禮服。正如N.T.賴特所宣講的：在基督裡，新造已經開始，唯有穿上那新造的人才是真正的家人。

本文向每一位讀者提出的問題，因此就是王本人的問題：ἑταῖρε，還是ἀδελφέ？你只是與基督有所聯繫，還是已被收養進入祂的家庭？你已經穿上了新我的禮服，還是穿著舊我的破衣爛衫站在宴會廳裡？你是否遵行天父的旨意——不是完美地，但是真誠地，出於一顆被聖靈破碎又重造的心？

因為「被召的人多，選上的人少」（πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, *polloi gar eisin klētoi, oligoi de eklektoi*，馬太福音22:14）。

APPENDIX: SUMMARY TABLE OF KEY GREEK TERMS

Greek	Transliteration	Meaning	Theological Function in Matthew
ἑταῖρε (vocative of ἑταῖρος)	*Hetaire*	"Friend" / "Associate" / "Supposed friend"	Term of divine rejection; marks one who is *outwardly* associated but *inwardly* not family
φίλος	*Philos*	"Beloved friend" / "Dear friend"	Term of genuine intimate bond (cf. John 15:15)
ἀδελφός	*Adelphos*	"Brother"	Term of true kinship; member of the family of God (cf. Matthew 12:50)

ἀδελφή	*Adelphē*	"Sister"	Term of true kinship; member of the family of God (cf. Matthew 12:50)
παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον	*Palaion anthrōpon*	"Old man" / "Old self"	The unregenerate nature that must be crucified (cf. Ephesians 4:22)
καινὸν ἄνθρωπον	*Kainon anthrōpon*	"New man" / "New self"	The regenerated nature that must be "put on" — the wedding garment (cf. Ephesians 4:24)
ἔνδυμα γάμου	*Endyma gamou*	"Wedding garment"	Symbol of regeneration, imputed and imparted righteousness in Christ
σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον	*Skotos to exōteron*	"Outer darkness"	Eschatological judgment — hell

---

Soli Deo Gloria.

À Dgieu seul la glouaithe.

唯獨上帝得榮耀。